

### REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-19 and 23-32 remain in the present application. Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-19 and 23-31 are amended herein. Claim 32 is added herein. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter was added as a result of the claim amendments and additions. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the amendments and arguments set forth below.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-19 and 23-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 11 and 19 as amended overcome this rejection.

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-19 and 22-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the rejection states that the present application fails to disclose the limitations “wherein an input at said first height corresponds to said first display component activated by said control circuit, and wherein an input at said second height corresponds to said second display component activated by said control circuit” as previously recited in independent Claims 1, 11 and 19. These limitations have been cancelled herein from independent Claims 1, 11 and 19. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that a discussion of this rejection is moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-19 and 23-25

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-19 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Number 6,788,292 to Nako et al. (hereafter referred to as "Nako") in view of United States Patent Number 5,396,443 to Mese et al. (hereafter referred to as "Mese"). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-19 and 23-25 are not rendered obvious by Nako in view of Mese for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1, which recites an electronic device comprising (emphasis added):

a first display component;  
a second display component disposed above said first display component; and  
an input component operable to detect inputs in proximity to a surface of said electronic device, wherein said input component is further operable to differentiate between respective heights of said inputs above said surface of said electronic device, and wherein said input component is further for enabling interaction with said first and second display components using said inputs at said respective heights above said surface of said electronic device.

Independent Claims 11 and 19 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 1. Claims 2-4, 8-10, 15-18 and 23-25 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Page 5 of the rejection states that Nako fails to teach or suggest an input component for detecting indications or inputs, and therefore, it follows that Nako also fails to teach or suggest such an input component operable to differentiate between respective heights of said inputs above said surface of said electronic device. Applicants concur.

Applicants respectfully submit that that Mese, either alone or in combination with Nako, also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “wherein said input component is further operable to differentiate between respective heights of said inputs above said surface of said electronic device” as recited in independent Claim 1. As recited and described in the present application, an electronic device is operable to differentiate between inputs at different heights (page 18, lines 10-11 and 15-16; page 19, lines 19-20; page 21, lines 13-14).

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Mese to teach a sensor for detecting a pen or finger at a given distance  $d$  from a device (Abstract; Figure 2; col. 4, lines 41-55), where the detection of the pen/finger causes the device to transition to an active state (Abstract). As such, even assuming *arguendo* that the detection of the pen/finger at distance  $d$  is analogous to an input as claimed, Mese fails to teach multiple inputs as claimed. Further, Mese fails to teach multiple inputs with respective heights as claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that both Nako and Mese fail to teach or suggest the limitations of “wherein said input component is further for enabling interaction with said first and second display components using said inputs at said respective heights above said surface of said electronic device” as recited in independent Claim 1. As recited and described in the present application, the multiple inputs detected at respective heights enable interaction with the first and second display components (page 19, lines 21-23; page 21, lines 15-17).

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion in Nako of inputs at respective heights for interacting with multiple display screens. Additionally, Applicants fail to find any teaching or

suggestion in Mese, either alone or in combination with Nako, of inputs at respective heights for interacting with multiple display screens.

Further, page 7 of the rejection seems indicate that Nako's teaching of 10mm is analogous to a height as claimed. However, Nako is referring to a distance between contact positions along the touch panel 15 as shown in Figure 6 (col. 9, lines 13-19). Thus, Nako teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching contacts *at the same height* along the same plane of touch screen 15 instead of inputs at different heights as claimed.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the combination of Nako in view of Mese, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Since independent Claims 11 and 19 recite limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1, independent Claims 11 and 19 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Since Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-21 and 23-25 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-21 and 23-25 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Therefore, Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-21 and 23-25 are allowable.

#### Claims 26-31

Claims 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nako in view of Mese and further in view of United States Patent Number 6,445,574 to Saw et al. (hereafter referred to as "Saw"). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of

the present invention as recited in Claims 26-31 are not rendered obvious by Nako in view of Mese and further in view of Saw for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that that Saw, either alone or in combination with Nako and/or Mese, fails to cure the deficiencies of cited Nako/Mese combination discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Saw also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “wherein said input component is further operable to differentiate between respective heights of said inputs above said surface of said electronic device” and “wherein said input component is further for enabling interaction with said first and second display components using said inputs at said respective heights above said surface of said electronic device” as recited in independent Claim 1, and similarly recited in independent Claims 11 and 19. Since Claims 26-31 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 26-31 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Therefore, Claims 26-31 are allowable.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-19 and 23-31 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 6/21, 2007

Bmf

Bryan M. Failing  
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060